The Anti-Kennedy (aka The Assassins) Campaign Becomes more Overtly Ford Defense and the only one of the CIA possible. HW 5/30/75

The pace and intensity of these stories accelerate. The departure from standards applied on other stories of this magnitude simultaneously disappear. The current one exemplies all these points.

NBC P.M. TV net News (Ch.11, 6:30) had an AP item only part of which I heard quoting Lansdale as saying that an intermediary close to JFK (refused to name) had ordered him to get rid of Castro in any way possible. Account included assassination. No second source.

CBS (Ch.9, 7 p.m. had this as the lead, opening item, summary by Cronkite leading into Harry Serafin, said to have interviewed Lansdale by phone. Here the story is not quite the same and has enough detail to make the whole thing highly suspicious.

This account is similar in the refusal to name the intermediary and has the same journalistic defects: no indication of Lansdale's, CIA stakes in the story; no questions of a professional military man (then colonel, now general) on why he paid any attention to such a directive outside the chain of command (can anyone believe that a President not irrational would work this way, putting himself forever in the debt of the CIA and all who knew).

Consistent with NBC in saying the idea to get rid of Castro any way possible: coup, assassination, etc.

The CBS account included an unidentified memo and Lansdale's claim to a hazy memory. (What could be more natural with all the direct Presidential orders to off all those heads of state? Who could possibly remember?) "Hazy memory" direct quotes, only as "memory hazy."

The CBS account has Lansdale attributing this alleged order to JFK's resentment at the Russian missles in Cuba (he'd sure teach them!) and the date is August 1962.

This creates a very large and I think insurmountable problem. JFK did not know of any Russian missles in Cuba then. The official story is that nobody did. it is that McGeorge Bundy gave him the news on awakening him I think 10/15/62.

For the CIA to stick to this story if it can be pushed it will have to admit withholding the proof from JFK, unless it can get away with fudging it.

He knew of the first missles earlier, the surface to air ones of limited range. The stories are that he did not object to "defensive" weapons.

With all the Vietnam assassination it is surprising that Lansdale was played so uncritically, especially when he claimed his memory was hazy and when there supposedly was a written record. More, why should he be allowed to pretend to believe that if there were anything to the story none of the investigations, which can compel his testimony, would not insist that he give the name so that person could be questioned?

However, unless that person turns out to be conveniently dead, he now has to be called. And if he does not confirm the account there is no way of withdrawing the effect of this story.

The whole thing presages a line of CIA defense: sure it did a few-very few-things under other leadership (esp. Democratic) that it should not have but alas there is this compulsion to serve the President. The (Democratic) president therefore is wrong.

By comparison Ford looks good. Meanwhile, the companion stories are all on alleged CIA wothholdings from the Warren Commission. (Some FBI.) Well, when these bad, bad people didn't let the Warren Commission know, how can anyone fault our Glorious Leader if the Commission erred?

All the parts fit neatly.

And how strange it is that there hasn't been a single leak of any other character. Nobdoy remembers the assassination of Che Guevara and the Bolivian Interior Minister who himself then was CIA and broke the story.

No other governmental overthrows are recalled. Of the many. Nothing before JFK is remembered, either. Not by leakers or reporters.